

m 990

Must Remain in  
Transcription Room

Dear Mr. Nyland,

I typed this from a rough draft of the tape, and I have tried not to change things. However, I occasionally did change the punctuation, mostly by putting in question marks when the sentence seemed to demand it, or by changing a comma to a semi-colon for easier reading. I have indicated all of these changes that I caught in proofreading with a light pencil underline; I have also underlined punctuation I retained but which I question.

On p.2 I underlined 'in total' because it was put in in the rough draft in pencil with a question mark and the original "intuitive" was not lined through. The same kind of thing occurs on p.11, but there I left a blank with a question mark and put part of impartiality in parenthesis.

On p.13 I indicated the lack of clarity in the draft in the typing.

On p.14 I underlined the titles of books.

On p.15 I didn't, but I changed the spelling of Yahweh and Elohim to their more conventional English forms. *in the draft*

On p.18 I omitted "have" and added it above the line; on another page I omitted "I" and added it in pencil; since there was obscurity in other parts of the text, I wasn't too finicky in this typing, and I would be very happy to retype the whole tape if you need a perfect copy once the text is fully established.

On p.22 I did not recognize the mystic "John Ro??" and I corrected the spelling of Erasmus.

On p.23, I changed 'Knossis' in the draft to 'Gnosis' and underlined "of" on the bottom of the page because it might make more sense as "or."

On p.27, near the top of the page I suggest "able not to have" rather than "able, not have." This is only suggested because no one caught the superfluous "'re" which should not be there grammatically, or else it should be "Your" which would make "want" a noun and not a verb, which would make a correct fragment, but would throw off the rhetorical balance of the succeeding sentences.

Otherwise I hope I didn't make any horrible stupendous mistakes and the copy meets with your approval and your needs.

*Helen Ulrich*

WEDNESDAY, MAY 25, 1966

Mr. Nyland "Well, what questions?"

Bruce Wiggins "The last few weeks I have the task of making my wife feel as if I care about her. (...) And next Monday I am leaving for Europe and would like another task. I will be alone for that for a month.

"She won't go along? What will she do?"

"Stay here and care for the baby."

"And what are you going to do?"

"Well, primarily to seek out universities. But also, for pleasure."

"Will she miss you?"

"I think so."

"Can you write her every day?"

"(...)."

"Alright. Not long, but just a few words."

"Can I have something in addition to that?"

"I think it's good. I think it's good enough, because I think that during the day you will think about what you are going to write. After a week it will be a little monotonous. Then after two weeks I think you will want to make a certain list of things that you want to tell her. All the time you have to imagine she is here doing the same thing. And you are in Europe, I would almost say, having a good time. All right? It'll help you. But strict adherence. No slipping up. Each day to be mailed. Ten oclock in the evening, mail it the next morning. All right? Good. Besides that, to write to me after two weeks that you kept your task. All right?"

"Yes."

( ) "What other philosophies and theories are most closely

aligned to that of Gurdjieff's? What similarities are found in other theories and philosophies?"

Mr Nyland "Have you found some?"

"From ... purely the Ouspensky meeting that I have done..."

"No Ouspensky. Lets call that Gurdjieff. We'll call Ouspensky Gurdjieff."

"Fine. More from being able to relate what you've said, I've seen similarities between other philosophies. But my reading is in Gurdjieffian philosophy such that I wouldn't be able to compare it at any length

"When you talk now about Gurdjieffian philosophy what is do you think (...)?"

"The belief that man can arrive and be more than what ... more than what he seems in a social sense. The fact that man is capable of , in a religious sense, transcending certain patterned or civilized aspects, that man accepts too easily a lesser image of himself."

"No, I mean the quintessence, In what respect does it differ from several other philosophies or religions?"

"It puts the (...) emphasis of changing or becoming on the man individual..."

"Not entirely true, but, in any event, there is a certain amount that man has to do. Right?"

"It relates more to the God in man rather than the God outside of him."

"That I don't know what you mean by..."

"You look for whatever is possible in ..."

Mr Nyland "Who is it? All right sit down quickly.... you see I don't know what you mean by God."

"I'm thinking of God in terms of the highest capacity of man. What man can, man understanding the universe and understanding himself in a totally objective and intuitive way."

"If man does not become what you think he might become, is there still a God?"

"Yes, because it exists in man's mind."

"Not in reality. I mean by reality existing not on this earth."

"Exist not on this earth?"

"... That is if man exists and he has a mind and his mind conceives of the idea of God, God is linked up to man. So he must then be linked up to earth because there are no other men outside of earth, not the kind we know. So then God becomes dependent on the mind of man. Is there anything in existence outside of the mind of man, outside of mankind, outside of the earth, anywhere else in the so-called universe, that could be compared to a God or some kind of a being entity which has so-called God-like qualities?"

"You want a personal reaction?"

"No, in general I think you use the word God. So if it is limited to man what is there outside of the earth?"

"When I used God in terms of man, I didn't mean to limit it in terms of man as a limited animal, I meant..."

"What, then the question is, what is, if there is any possibility of comparing, what is more? If that what is outside the earth, has that more value or less value? Or is it the same? Is it a separate entity? Is it connected with that what might be in the mind

of man? If his thoughts are certain concepts, have they reality of existence like man has? You see, you have to define that."

"I don't think you can limit God by man. And yet, I think the concept of God is most often understood in terms of man."

"I think that is right. I don't think you can limit it, you see. But exactly because you cannot limit it, you have to allow for an existence then outside of man."

"You have to live with the paradox of it. I think the paradox is the most important. The paradox of man being defined by man and yet not limited by that definition."

"The question is, is mind of man the ultimate?"

"Only if it's God!"

"Thunderstorms...?"

"Perhaps man can cause it."

"...or of constellations and stars, movement in the sky or in space or even the planets which do not belong to the earth primarily? Is there some form of God, deity, as Gurdjieff would call it, His Endlessness in existence? Is there a reasonable doubt that he doesn't exist? You see it comes to this question... is the universe intelligently conceived or not? To what extent man can understand it, that depends on his capacity. And whatever it is in man at the present time is developed, his mind, or whatever he can think or conceive of, that that might be able to define to a certain extent and exist outside of himself. But still even if you say it must exist because it seems reasonable to assume it. Then one ends not simply by making that kind of a statement; but there is then certain research necessary for man in order to satisfy that kind of an assumption and to come to a reality which evidence says yes it is real. Even if I do not know exactly how it is completely put together. I will have an hypothesis in order to explain

it to me whatever it is. And this one would call an intelligent concept. You see, that is one part. The other is, is(...) in the universe a certain current or a certain relationship in existence which will allow for development. It's quite a different problem because I can assume that certain things exist and that they exist forever and ever and that they will not deteriorate. And then, when that happens to exist in my opinion, as far as in my mind that kind of a concept can take hold of me, then I start to compare it with conditions that I do know something about which are conditions on earth. Then if that is the truth, that such a thing continues to exist forever and ever, it is not true on earth. Now if earth is a part of the universe, even if it's a small part, then why should that particular kind of a law exist on earth and not in the rest of the universe? And logically, I must come to the conclusion that outside of me, outside of earth, somewhere in the universe, there also has to be the same kind of an existence that happens to be on earth. Again you see the intelligence that is necessary for the assumption of taking that as something that must exist for me must then exist totally. Now if it changes, that is, if there are constant changes in the universe or in myself or on earth, is then there a possibility of maintaining it on the level where it is by some kind of a method (...) or if there is something that I say that what is outside of the earth is worth more because it is of a different kind of quality and I try to define that in some way or other even if it remains subject to laws of destruction, is there a possibility of getting away, as it were, from earth in order to establish in my mind this time, because I cannot go, the possibility of something existing which becomes less and less subject to the laws of destruction. And then that must include if that is possible, a certain growing

from one thing to another in the direction which becomes freer. So you see you have there now different concepts to which a logical way of looking, either as religion or philosophy, has to answer. And man will never be satisfied by just taking a certain assumption first play that he is the only one who exists and he is the center of the universe and that that will be an explanation that everything will remain the way it is because it doesn't. And that therefore, if man discovers in himself that he is subject to the law of destruction, how can he prolong his life if that is the important part for him? And then if this question of intelligence extends so far as to government, that is certain rules or laws for the universe as a whole, you see from that, it is not so difficult to come to a concept that I can consider for myself God as some being who has more or superior knowledge compared to me and that if I would like to be free from that what now binds me that then the development would have to go in the direction of that kind of a higher being in order to find out if at such a level I would really be free and perhaps then I could understand what may be meant by endlessness. See these are common terms that must be used, of course they have to be used in any kind of religion and any kind of a description or any kind of dogma but that then presupposes that when I become interested, I have to do something in order to maintain myself because the phenomena on earth quite definitely indicates that if I don't do anything else, but just take in some food and live, that after some years, something happens to me and I die. And again, many other questions would come up with that so I have to settle again for myself what is life that I consider myself to be as a manifestation of some form that I still call life, which leaves me at least as far as my physical body is concerned when I die. And is there a possibility



that that form of life after it has lived on earth and because of death is free from the bondage of the physical existence, does something remain? So again that question brings up, is there a possibility of the continuation of life in the so-called hereafter and where is the hereafter? And what is this question that heaven, earth, hell, purgatory, all such ideas, they have to be settled in some way or other? You see, I am now talking about an intelligent concept of that what religiously is called the organization or the universe itself, or something that I call God or a deity which either governs or has interest or has no interest at all, or considering myself a replica of such an endless being but with human qualities which I describe as myself possess and then ascribe them to the idea that God also must be the same kind of a thing. So that I say that man is made in God's image, what I really mean is God is made in man's image. Now you see if you start to compare the different religions that you do know about with that what Gurdjieff represents in description and book Beelzebub or whatever he has left as a legacy, that then I say in what respect is any kind of a religion that I know to be compared with that what Gurdjieff gives. And what are the essential factors about Gurdjieff's teaching? In the first place it assumes that the universe is intelligent, that there is his Endlessness called by such a name, that there are different levels of being, that there is a possibility of growth from one level to another, that the totality of the universe is maintained in a state of equilibrium by constantly moving from one place to the other and returning again to the first place (...) and that therefore, the question of the variety of forms of life as different manifestations are in constant flux, and that man having a certain place on earth, can definitely assert a place in the universe, that that for certain



reasons, man has either a difficulty or at least partly a misunderstanding and partly a good concept of that what he might become, assuming for a moment that he is at this kind of a level that he is still trying to develop, that as yet he is not there, and that for that it is necessary for man to know what to do about it. So if one comes down to that point what is actual possibility of an application of that what I know religiously speaking or philosophically to be that what my life is, then I say to what extent does Gurdjieff give me some idea of what I have to do? Or is it not dependent on me, is it simply a question of grace, a question of prayer, of something that I believe that someone else is going to do for me? Or that I automatically will be taken up to Heaven when I die, or do I need some people who know better than I, who might be priests or rabbis or ministers or whatever, or that it is necessary even to have concepts like Christianity that there should be a mediator in order to bring about a bridge between man on earth and God in Heaven (...) and that there is for that particular reason the condition as I find it on earth. Is it necessary for me to understand it in such a way that sometimes like Christianity it may be called sin or eternal sin that I was born in, that I could not help the way I am? And that many of these things are related to what man is at the present time and how can he get rid of what he actually has or so-called possesses. So you see it becomes quite complicated because now you have to settle what is really given by Gurdjieff as a means of escape? And if you start to compare that now with what you know of other religions what is there in other religions which will give an escape to man because unquestionably it is true that he is bound and he knows that? Even if he is only bound by death, can he to some extent meet death? Can he as he now is represented by a form of life and walking around in the shape of a human being, continue to exist as life without his body? And if

I can assume for my own satisfaction that that would be most reasonable explanation then I will try to look for a way of how to find out that I can loosen myself from the bondage of earth. You see I use now different kind of terms from different philosophies and religions, and it is exactly there that I start to compare what does so-and-so tell me. What do the Sufis tell me, mystical, Islamitic, what is it that they represent? What do the mystics in general tell me, trying to unite with what they call their Godhead? What does Zen tell me? What does Vedanta tell me? What is Buddhism? And Buddhism talks about the only way. What is the only way? What is the escape, Gurdjieff himself calls it esoteric christianity. What is esoteric? Is there a distinction between as Gurdjieff uses it exoteric, mesoteric and esoteric? What is esoteric? What is in that sense now the Bible? What is in the Revelations of the Bible? What can I find out of the secrets of time? What is the Secret Doctrine of Blavatsky (...) Do they know anything? Are there chakras? Are there certain roads for perfection? What is it that I have to do in order to get rid of that what is now as I say binding me, in order to enter a certain state of peace? Could I call it Nirvana? Is it possible that absoluteness exists without being eaten? Is it needed for me that I eat instead of being eaten by circumstances? What am I as so-called human creature with an idea that I ought to be like God? Is God man or man God as Ba Ba indicates? Is God love and what do I mean by love? Is it possible in accordance with the Bible to follow the ten commandments? And if I cannot, why not? Is it necessary to have a Pope as the head of the Roman Catholic church? Why is constantly dissensions among people that they cannot understand each other even in an ordinary spiritual way? Why is it that spiritualism as such, clairvoyance and the rest has such a tremendous difficulty

to reconcile it with scientific and technological development? You see all these questions come up when I start to think about it. It is not too easy to settle it in what way now is Gurdjieff's ideas objective, either objective morality or objective understanding come to be compared with any existing kind of philosophy. I am limited even in reading and I may not even know what exists. Do I believe that the Hopis have an idea about God like I have? Or do they? And where are the people who can actually indicate that certain things exist which at the present time with my present perception cannot (...) extra sensory perception, Cayce, people who are clairvoyant, people who do know, who tell of the future, who predict, who prophesy? All of that you see. Now I could come a little bit lower to the ground, Idea of Gurdjieff has man as he is. Idea is that he is incomplete. Idea is that he has no soul. This immediately distinguishes from many religions who claim that man has a soul. Gurdjieff would say that man has to work ~~to have~~ a soul, that he has the potentiality/for, that it actually could develop if he knows how. How to develop it by certain methods of what Gurdjieff calls objectivity, which means that if the bondage as represented on earth by subjective living man that then freedom must by definition be something that is objective... and if something could develop in man to become objective regarding his surrounding he would go on the road, at least the first step, towards freedom. What is it that Gurdjieff means by impartiality when he writes an impartial objective criticism of the life of man in order what he then says to destroy mercilessly concepts that he has? Why did he write the second series. Remarkable Men as he explains? In order to show that certain forms of life as manifestation of man do exist, and perhaps might give hope to someone believing then that it would be possible for man to develop simply because there are already

and have been examples of such people existing.... And then in the third series, actually trying to disclose what a man ought to do in order to follow that particular kind of path. Let's call it enlightenment, in order to develop certain possibilities which are now potential in him and because of that have, let's say, a chance of living in something that is not subject to the law of decay as we know it in the materialistic form as represented by physical body. So you see when I now (...) impartiality then it presupposes that I know what is impartiality.... and that for the sake of argument man being defined as being composed of three centres that then there is a certain concept that starts to make sense because now comes back to earth, comes back to myself (...) and that for the reason that Gurdjieff says self-study, and self-awareness, self-remembering, is necessary for man. But now it comes into certain terminology which is possible for me to even conceive and perhaps to have an experience of. Now if I consider man then a three centred being which for sake of argument is very logical way of assuming that he is actually that (...) that then again physically speaking he must be complete because he doesn't grow any further. And it would be quite idiotic to imagine a man growing taller and taller because it wouldn't add very much to his body and it probably would make it much more cumbersome. So let's assume for a moment that his physical body is complete as far as he's concerned. And again, introducing certain concepts of an octave or quite definitely certain symbolism which exists in the Gurdjieff system, they indicate to some extent what may be the laws behind that what is actually happening (...) and that many of the symbols can be understood if man starts to develop a certain faculty in himself which at the present time he doesn't possess. We'll assume for a moment that man has that chance and does it in accordance with Gurdjieff, and that then the results would be that he would be a

completed, harmonious , as Gurdjieff calls it, man, functioning on earth in relation to other people and in relation to his own soul or in relation to that what he might call an obligation towards his own God. Now you see many of these concepts are overlapping. And they are much too extensive to say just a few words. But these are things that are quite inherent in the system as a whole and are logical, that is, they have a definite human quality, they are psychologically correct as far as one knows because they indicate more or less in what direction explanations could become acceptable, and also placing man for a certain reason on earth and earth for a certain reason in the rest of the cosmic scale and the concept of a cosmic ray which surely is developed enough, the place where earth is in relation to the sun and the sun as a solar system, that every level of being, theosophically speaking probably, dependent on where everyone is in the totality of the universe, the idea of finiteness as linked<sup>up</sup> with subjectivity and infinity as linked up with objectivity, the question of placing God as a certain being, an entity, which has intelligence to govern, but again one uses for that governing something that one calls ones own intellect. But if I could understand in my own experience what may be meant by 'being' and that 'being' as a unit could represent something of a unity which although in the unity it has been made out of component parts, that then the question of properties or of certain qualities of units, are now able to function on a plane different from wherever they came from as represented by the components, So you see now when I talk about this impartiality, the influence of the emotional centre on decisions or activities, and then the<sup>influence</sup> of the mind, which I say mind thinks presupposes that what is future becomes for me past when it has flown through me and then if I could be aware of that what ~~has~~ flows through me as a present, then I start to question do I know what the present

is when I emphasize all the time as a mental function that what I anticipate and that what I remember. So again you see where is intelligence for man if it is possible that all he can do with his mind, again I say this maybe an assumption, but I have to verify it, that he only thinks in his way, and that his way of thinking is in associative thought and has very little to do with originality. Well, its not necessary to (...) all of that, but if I want something to be compared to that, the freedom for oneself, in order to become free in the form of impartiality or non-identification, it's a concept that exists in many philosophies. (...) for instance conferences will talk about that and will indicate that there is a possibility of man becoming actually then in his own development to become free and sometimes its called maturity, sometimes its called the kind of freedom that logically will follow when man lives, and the assumption is that man could live some 2 or 3 or 4 hundred years automatically, that is naturally, would develop this kind of quality for himself. As far as mind is concerned in its limitations of thought that is something that is not so easily settled by a variety of different religions. The only one who comes close to it is Zen. Zen certainly emphasises moments, but I don't understand moments, and much of that which is Zen is much too Eastern for me to live actually into that kind of understanding, for me to be able even to conceive what is meant by a moment. Gurdjieff, of course, talks about it and about the whole question of time, the whole question of what is time for us and what is Heropass for his Endlessness. All of it comes into that and it is a logical building up of certain explanations which, when I start then to think about it and I try<sup>A</sup> to verify them with my experience, that I say, yes, it might really fit in. So you see what is there in Vedanta and Buddhism, in certain forms of Buddhism? You probably

know 'The Sayings of the Buddha' in which this question of the only way is mentioned. There are various others... the Baghavad Gita, What do I know, the whole concept of the Mahabharata or the Ramanuja or much of the Indian Philosophies, ethics or not whatever may be, either one or the other of certain forms of Buddhism, it doesn't matter which one that <sup>I</sup> will take... can I find out what is really meant. Shintoism, Taoism, if I become interested in it what do they represent for me that I can understand with my Western mind? Can I live in it? Do I or could I live in accordance with certain precepts that they live? Is it respectable even to live that way? Now if I bring it back to myself, can I live my own religion? Can I bring to my ordinary life certain forms of even an idealism perhaps, or something that I call a morality that really has substance enough to maintain itself? And to what respect would it be respected? And then when I look at the different representatives of certain religions or whatever may be religious currents in this civilization and I see the examples in front of my eyes and I see what they do and I still see that they are subject to all kind of sins in the ordinary sense of the word. Is it in Christian Science that I ought to find possibility? Is it Emerson? Is it William James? Is it really study of psychology? If I take a book from William James 'The Variety of Religious Experience' and I try to see what has been at the time and what is still, Greek Mythology. Can I understand mythology? Do I know something about folklore, folklore remnants of certain beliefs? What is true of Atlantis? You know one can roam all over the place. Out of all that, one ought to extract certain things that are quite fundamental, and then when I say they are fundamental, when they become for me something that I can hold onto and that gives an explanation to different questions I have. The more questions are answered for me, the more I will adhere to that



kind of a system. If you see now the question of God, if I say God as his Endlessness, what is God in me? What is my God? To what extent can I even talk about it? Do I believe I can use religion? That I shouldn't even mention his name? Should I say Jahve, or Aleoham, or what? What was it? What do I believe in Genesis? What do I know about the Zohar or the Torah? What do I know about the Koran? You see I must go back time and time again in a real study of it. And then on that kind of basis I can start comparing what Gurdjieff has said try to say what perhaps I can understand or not understand or what he hints at or what is hidden. But you see I need a lifetime also. And not only the life of study as far as my mind is concerned, but that what is actual practise and experience on which I then can base my life and say this is the representation of what I believe in. You see the question is not easily settled."

Barry Jacobs "More and more I find myself pondering or trying to understand 'moment', because I find more and more that my ordinary mind by its very nature fights any kind of living in the moment."

Mr Nyland "I don't think it fights as it were."

"Whatever it is I find it..."

"Of course it's difficult because the mind is an instrument and it has to have the limitations of an instrument? You see whenever something, let's say, is colored it is limited to that particular (....). I may like it to be different, but it isn't. If a square (...) doesn't fit into a round hole, it simply means that they are not fitted together so they will not be able to make any kind of a combination. If a key doesn't fit a lock, it's just too bad. It is a key, and it is a lock. But if there is, I now talk about a moment which I conceive of as existing, and logically can explain when I say that time is like a duration of certain moments one after another, then it is still a question of how I can become

aware of such a concept when it actually happens so that it is registered in my mind as a moment...and then I think one must come to a conclusion that I never know. As soon as I would say a moment is there, it is gone. So there is nothing in my mind that I can say in my ordinary mental process with which I (...) and which I call thinking and sometimes even pondering, whatever it may be, formulating, whatever happens in my mind, whatever such mental processes are, that they are<sup>only</sup> capable of seeing certain things coming and going without possibly arresting it at a moment of existence. I can try it, but as soon as I try it time goes, and that moment goes. I can say that the next moment is the same as the past moment, it is true, but when it is something different as a moment, then I have no way of conceiving of it simply because the concept that I would have has nothing to hold on to in my mind as a registering something that becomes tangible. Now it may be true that the mind is incapable of doing it at the present time, at the same time I can also say that I<sup>can</sup> get close to the idea of a moment when I see what is future and becoming in me, through me, a past; and that then certain moments coming towards me and certain moments of the past having gone from me that there may be a certain way in my mind of bringing them together as a moment from the future and a moment from the past, bring them together with a certain mental act, and then conceive of them as if they meet and I am at that moment in between and then I would experience a moment. Well, this may be very nice mental arithmetic, but again it's extremely difficult. It would be as close as I possibly could get to the possibility of developing a mind that I do have in the direction in which the mind at the present time functions. And I'm afraid that after a little while, I would have to come to the conclusion that as long as the mind remains bound up with this idea of thought, then that the thought is

practically the only kind of mental process that I know, that there never will be a way out in conceiving or experiencing the existence of a moment."

"What I want to say is that kind of reasoning is the kind of reasoning I went through and what I am interested in, want to say, is there must be another way other than thought or rational... and does it come closer to feeling like I say?

"No, it is not a feeling. That I'm afraid that a feeling is not sufficiently defining. You see, for my mind in order to have something that I can put my finger on, I have to have something <sup>that is</sup> in a form that I can recognize. And I can say that within this form there's a content. That content for me represents a concept or an idea which is now represented by something which is like that form. But when I put it on the basis of a feeling, there is no particular form, but only a very vagueness sometimes I try to define it as a rate of vibration which takes place, but again that means a certain movement of things and they never stay in their own place. So a feeling would be very difficult to define even in terms of a terminology of a moment, because with a moment I have to have the realization of something existing at the moment and not moving. You see otherwise I don't have a moment. As soon as it moves, it is or has moved it ~~is either~~ <sup>and is now</sup> has been future ~~or it will be~~ past. So it is the realization of that what is the cutting of a line by means of another line and then I would have a point. If a line represents a time duration of certain movement for one place to another and I cut it with another line perpendicular, then that where that hits that particular point would represent the moment. And if there were many lines like that vertical on this horizontal, the movement of that, the different point, would indicate that time moving and I call it time duration. Sometimes I say first dimension of time. You see, so

now when I see this that my mind is only capable of this time duration then in order to have a point in time that is made by this vertical line, the concept of my mind has to be either expanded or something has to change fundamentally. Now if I expand it I retain the same qualities of subjective interpretation. And again I will not be able to extract from my mind something that is non-subjective, <sup>when the totality of my mind is subjective</sup> and I can not do anything about it. But introduction of a new kind of a concept and I now call it objectivity because this question of vertical line crossing a horizontal one belongs to that when I am on this vertical line away from the horizontal represents for me objectivity regarding the horizontal line. As long as I am on the line I remain subjective is the way of defining. When I get away from it it becomes objective, that is I'm not bound by that kind of subjectivity. So when it's a question of introducing into a mental function or a mental conglomeration/certain things that I call objective which I also must have a new word for because it is not a thought process, and it is not mental process that I know of, and sometimes I say it's an unconscious one, then I can contrast it to calling it conscious, only a different kind of a word. If I say objectivity all right, but now if I want to describe the experience I use another word. I say an awareness. Now an awareness is something that is different from a thought. At the same time an awareness also leads to knowledge. An awareness, I would almost say, is in between a thought and an intuition. And intuition is defined as something resultant of a feeling realization also leading to a thought, to a particular knowledge that then an awareness can have a very definite quality of becoming aware of a moment. In any event I start to define it like that. And since I now have this moment of awareness as a possible concept it has to satisfy the requirement of objectivity. So whenever I now want to talk about an awareness, I have to have in my mind a certain ability which can be aware and not think. So you see if I know

this now as a theory, then its a question, can I develop it in such a way that becomes practical and that when it is based on practical experience, I would have a right to say the theory's correct. But if it is not possible for me to do it, then the theory won't help me at all and I have to let it go."

"Yes this is the crux of it all..."

"Yes it is the crux because unless I can have the experience of an awareness in my own experience which is independent of anyone else telling me, but has to be the result of something that I being myself set in motion and being in command of that which I want my mind to do, what I wish my body to do, what I wish my feeling to do, what something in me wishes my personality to do, that if it is possible for this personality in any one of the three different centres to function in such a way that there is a resultant experience of awareness then I would have solved the problem and my theory is correct."

"Well, can you develop the facility of recognizing moments?"

"The question is now when it is put that way, to what extent I am capable. You see, here's a problem as something that perhaps could solve the particular situation in which I am. And it is necessary now to develop this faculty or new kind of faculty of awareness. And the only thing I have to do is to verify for myself and consider it an experience and then I will say the theory is correct. The difference between the theory and that what is action is a working hypothesis."

"Then if I understand what you're saying, the only way to recognize a moment is to work to be aware?"

"The only way to recognize a moment is first to build something that can actually recognize it. As I said a little while

ago about the limitations of the instrument of the mind the way it is, it has to become something or something has to develop that actually could be used as an instrument which then has a characteristic of being able to experience awareness whenever it is confronted with a moment of time. That would be the only logical way of explaining it. And if it is possible for man to develop that kind of faculty, then he has proven to himself, then it is possible and it exists for him."

"This awareness of a moment... I hate to be theoretical.."

"No, its not a question of theory. When once a concept, now you have to try to see if you could become aware."

"The clouds in my head go round and round, this working to become more and more aware of myself existing in a moment. Does this ever lead me to an understanding of the moment that presently I can't conceive, and that this new element that will come in, and understanding will lead me away from the earth..."

"No, not necessarily away from <sup>the</sup> earth, although for the moment of existing in an objective sense one would not be bound by earth if its original image of the vertical line crossing the horizontal, then when it is a situation on the vertical line, of course to that extent that I'm away from the horizontal one I am free from earth. But since it's only a moment it doesn't do much harm. If I continue to have moments of awareness and if constantly in those moments, as you might say strung out in a form of a certain time element, that then I could be aware for a certain length of time, I would call it a state of awakening. Now if that state of awakening as an experience is different from that what I consider in ordinary life, Gurdjieff would call it waking-sleeping state, if I know by experience that it is different, then there's no question anymore

for anyone telling me that it is not. I have verified for myself that I can have that experience, I know it, I know when my eyes are open. I know when they are closed. So when I compare it with the question of being awake or asleep, I also know that in the state of conscious awareness, I am at a different state from unconscious sleep."

"Still troubled with my ordinary mind."

"Of course, your mind will all the time..."

"I mean I can't tell if my work is still my mind  
the  
adjusting itself to a concept..."

"I would almost say, you have to wait until you experience it as a result of constantly trying to make such efforts or you have to wait until it happens accidentally."

"And is the new element not of this earth? It has such a mystical cloud about it."

"Let's first try to see that you experience and that you know what you are talking about..."

"How do I know the experience?"

"It's the point. How do you know?"

"I might experience it and not know it."

"How did the little chicken in the egg know when the world surrounded it (...) several times. The mother tells the little chicken. "Come out, peck that shell and come out." And then the little chicken says. "How do I know?" And she says, "Peck it, peck it, do it, do it." But how do I know? You say it's beautiful weather, the sun shines, blue sky, and all the rest, and the grass is green. And how do I know, I'm here in the egg." And the mother says "Go ahead, peck it (...), you will see it yourself." And of course the chicken won't see until it does. When it does a whole world opens up. This is the difference. I can say, yes sure it can exist but how do I know



it exists for me? Only if I do it. If I don't try to make an attempt to try to find out what is this idea of an awareness, what is this idea of getting a certain amount of knowledge as a result of something<sup>that</sup> I do which is not a result of a thought or a result even, as I said before of an intuition. But which reaches my mind in some way as a concept of existence that is as knowledge which has not gone through the regular roads of a thinking process. The new name I have 'awareness'. Do I know what is meant by it? You see then I find out, what is it? Well, it is like a state of being awake. All right. It is like a new taste. It's like a realization of something you've never had before. It is like a realization that sometimes has happened accidentally in which one knows one exists and at the same time the ordinary processes of personality apparently do nothing. They are like moments I will never forget. So I say do I have, have I had moments? I look back in my past. Have I had moments that were for some reason or other given to me or at least I experienced in which I found that I was in existence, and at the same time it looked to me as if I was not functioning as an ordinary human being, but it was some kind of realization by my being there, as if at that moment I was free from earth, ....., a realization as a result of a shock which effected me, shook me up, and somehow or other changed for one moment the configuration of myself into perceiving something which I did not <sup>receive</sup> ~~read~~ through my mental function. You see I go through a strict religious history and see where are these moments of enlightenment. I try to understand what Blake means or Eckhart or whoever it is, any one of the mystics, John Rotl, I don't care who you want to say, Saint Theresa, John of the Cross, whatever it may be. I go through all the different statements people have made, Erasmus, St Augustine Confessions, (...), all that I read read, find out, they describe moments of existence, moment of unity with God, moment of being able

to have spiritual life, moments of being entirely clear, moments of certain enlightenment, a certain relationship towards that what is a higher force as if we are lifted away from earth, moments of heaven, moments of heaven on earth, realization of heaven within one, realization of Saul on the road to Damascus when he changed his name to Paul, why, because of an experience, he describes it, the moment when Luther and his friend and the friend was struck by lightening and there was Luther realizing at that moment a certain aim that he had fulfilled and he became the founder of the Lutheran religion. Vedanta, same kind of a problem. You know, Calvin in Geneva. What is it you see that happens to such people that they try to describe and I look, I read, I try to understand them, I read the (Book?), I can't understand, unseen warfare, I don't know, Mt Athos, what have they got that I haven't. I come across the Knossis by Boris (...) and there I see symbolism and they appeal to me, I say where is it? How can I find it? And all it says, you little chicken, peck that shell. All right. Good luck."

Tony Montenero: "In the All and Everything which we're reading every day there's one section called Intentional Suffering in which he says one way of doing the system is to endure any bad feeling or bad manifestation towards you from someone else. I would like to have you expand a little bit more on the word endure."

Mr. Nyland: "Tony, it's not only that. It is necessary to endure the manifestation of someone else but what that means is the possibility of enduring everybody with whom one comes in contact and everybody with whom you can't come in contact but whose contact you seek out. So it is actually to begin to manifest as one wishes in the presence of the manifestation of the enemy of those people who surely are not friends who also have an intention of doing

wrong to you. So it includes the totality of all kinds of experiences of man on earth as represented by whatever there is as particular specimen of mankind of which one is one for oneself. But it's only very small form of suffering, and although it may not be possible to do it, I doubt very much that a person is actually capable unless he has something within himself which he calls his own solidity, he will then be able to live away far enough from the periphery of his life that he will not be effected by someone on the outside because man as he is ~~is~~ a reacting human being. But intentional suffering and that what is conscious labor is a step in the possible developement of man which I would say is very far advanced and it is not at all as it belongs to higher mathematics...it is something that comes over to calculus. It is not at all ABC. It is not addition, subtraction, multiplication, and unless I go through all these little formalities of building up logically certain things in order to find out what is one equation and another , roots and so forth, before I come to calculus, that I really will not come or even have to deal with anything that constitutes conscious suffering and intentional labor. The meaning as a concept is simply that there is a creation of conditions which I now by means of conscious labor want to overcome and meet and that I know that in creation of such conditions I will suffer. But having created them myself, the suffering is now intentional. Well you see it presupposes many things. It presupposes in the first place complete control over oneself. It also presupposes that one has developed something that can remain awake for any length of time and that has been tested sufficiently in all kind of strange conditions or ordinary conditions in which man might find himself, and then experiencing the actions

of such conditions on one, that although he may react that that what is his "I" remains in existence and is undisturbed...and that creation of such conditions as represented by intentional suffering is a creation by man's "I" and not by anything of the personality. That's why I say it's a very very far-off step, and if you want to compare it to a logical sequence of how one step follows another as represented by octave, intentional suffering belongs to the 'fa' of an octave starting out with 'do', 'do' meaning observation, including non-identification or impartiality and including simultaneity of which 're' of that same octave represents participation, a very definite step different from observation, and the third 'me' represents experimentation, again an expansion of that what is observation. That ~~why~~ when the 'do-re-me' of that octave has been fulfilled and has come to a point in which the three as a triangle have become one, triad become one, triunity becoming a unit, that then one is really at a point in which this 'fa' bridge can be overbridged by meanings of intentional suffering and creation of such different situations. It presupposes that man is capable in the creation of that, that his feeling center, that is his real emotion has developed also up to certain points where energy represented of that kind as a wish this time representing a real wish is available for him for the creation of such conditions. So you see, hand in hand with the 'do-re-me', what is called on an intellectual scale, the first triad of that particular octave, parallel to that is the 'so-la-si' of what Gurdjieff calls the Kesdjianian body... and that at the point of 'si-do' which from an emotional standpoint is the deliverance of emotion into further freedom of 'si-do' breaking that bondage and then quantity of energy released by that process can be used for creation of conditions which will cause me, that is whatever there is of me,

suffering of a very intentional nature. But you see much of this is theory. One doesn't fuss with it, it is impossible at the present time."

"Strange, for the first time I followed you all the way through."

"The first time you understood..."

"Really, I try very hard to follow completely what you say and I often will almost grasp all of it but not having personal experienced some of the things you talked about, I can't hold onto it. But this time I followed."

"Then salt it away, and at the proper time eat it. Well, is that now what we want to talk about? Theory? Or is there anything practical, anything that bothers you? Maybe problems? Who is going away over the summer? What are you going to do except he who's going to Europe? Vacation, how are you going to spend it? What will you do during such a time that you haven't done before for which the vacation period may be very good? What are you going to do to settle things for yourself your account, your personal account, the account with your conscience, the account that belongs to you as a human being, and that perhaps there are many things that you have avoided, that you didn't want to settle because they were too difficult or you were too lazy? Why not a vacation away from ordinary cares in which you probably will spend some (...) at a different place, different surrounding, and it might help you much more spiritually, because after all it is a question of your spiritual life. The body will die, there's no doubt about that. What can remain in existence? What can you now do to build it? Because if you don't build it, (...) dying won't have a chance.

It will be gone. So if you start to build something now maybe there is a possibility of gradually moving over into that what, let's call it a different kind of an ethereal quality. But you have to work you know. One works for a living. One works also for a continuation of life. One works for one's soul. It is not given. God is not interested in people with souls on earth. He is only interested in people with souls who do not wish to live forever on earth. And it's a question of being able, not have to live on earth. Then perhaps you can solve the problem of freedom on earth so that perhaps at a certain time, you can choose, either continue to live what might be a conscious state in the form of participating in life, or you might say I am glad to die. It would mean then an entry into a different form of living and all kind of other philosophies that you like, different (...) being.

You see here we are confronted with practical problems, your life, the way you have to earn your living, how you spend your time and vacation. And vacation where/with what? Same thing all the time? Same kind of people, same kind of poker playing faces, same kind of TV, same kind of driving a car from one place to the other, 500 miles, 600 miles, to boast? Your friends, same kind of stories all the time, a little bit of politics, Time Magazine so that you know a little bit of what someone else is not thinking? All these kind of things you see. Where are you? What are you going to do with it? What is your life going to be this coming week? Are you interested? Are you really interested in your own life? Is it just superficial? These are the problems I think you have to consider because you're not little children. You're want to be a man, you want to grow up to understand life. You want to understand your place. What is your aim? Where do

you want to be? Assume you will live a little longer, where will you be ten years from now, twenty from now? What will you be as a man? In what respect will you answer to that what is your obligation? If you know, it is really put on you as a responsibility because you happen to live on earth. There's no getting away from that. Do you want to take it or do you just want to die, return to dust, sure, there is one life, finished, then what after? Finished, nothing nothing. Can you understand that? Nothing. After death nothing, absolutely nothing. Unless you want to believe in re-incarnation or (reincarnation?) or different forms of life after death? And what is there that prepares you? What is there even to guide? What is there at the present time can help you to control yourself, to understand your relationships of what you have to do, sacrifices that you can do or not do, not want to do? What is objections in you? What does your body want? What does your mind want, your feeling? Where are you as a man? You see these are problems I think you ought to think about and you have a little bit more free time. And a vacation is a very good time for that so that you become really when you return refreshed, not physically, that is nonsense. But really with ambition, with aspiration, with desire to grow, with wanting to become, knowing well enough what you are not. That you then try to become something, somebody, Gurdjieff would say harmonious man. What is harmonious and what is man? A man, a creature who can do at any one place that what is required, at any one time with the means that are needed for that particular situation. To solve a problem or to help others to be a man, either speaking or not speaking, to be able to feel in the right way in accordance with a certain objective law, not in accordance with selfishness. And that in-



sight, realization of that what is mentally possible for man, of an understanding of a certain kind on which understanding then is activity, his wish to do can be based, idealism, wish to continue to live, wish to create for your self your life with the help of a deity even if you want to create that but at least ~~you~~ might have for you a certain sanctity, that you wish to live up to that if you possibly can in order perhaps, yielding towards it or submerging with it...but in any event a quality which becomes less and less destructive, that it will not ever, that it could remain permanent, be destroyed and that you become responsible person. Vacation is coming you know? Think a little bit. Make a little list. Life will not always continue this same way like (...) restores. Don't believe in the facade of your own hypocrisy. Don't think that you are clever when you know you're stupid. That you will have to learn a great deal. Try to start, maybe, with very small things. Who is a friend of a friend? Who is a husband of a wife? Who is a father of children? Who is responsible in professional work? Who is not lazy? Who has within him a conscience that he could if he died tomorrow, not be sorry that he actually said, I have done whatever I should have done so help me God? You can't get away from religion. You can't get away from spiritual development. You can't get away from your feeling which you hope some day will be real emotion and might lead you away from earth by means of the development of that so that you could actually become free man to live here or to return, or to be in any event what you should be. Use your time, don't waste it. Much and much energy flows over the dam, absolutely gone without any regress, without you being able to hold onto it. It is not lost, of course, nothing gets lost, but it is in a form that is not available for you. All of that energy that you spend at the present time,

And that really you should become responsible for, as if you were a manager of a factory, being the efficiency engineer and taking care of the correct distribution of all forms of power. This should be your life. Once a day for fifteen minutes to sit quiet and consider that, here I am, what is this earth? What do I wish? How much do I pay for it? Is it worth it? Will I continue? Is there enough life in me to wish to continue? Is it worthwhile, and then get up and go and do and live in accordance with the golden rule of your own conscience...and for which you have all the <sup>wisdom in the</sup> world available if you want to digest it, and for which all kind of experiences would be used by yourself provided you try to remain conscious. So I'll see you next week if you want to come. Goodnight everyone.